

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



POLICY RESEARCH NOTES

USDA
NAT'L AGRIC LIBRARY
1977 DEC 11 11 A 4:04
CENTRAL SERIAL RECORDS
AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

PUBLISHED BY THE NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH
COMMITTEE AND ECONOMICS, STATISTICS, AND COOPERATIVES SERVICE, USDA

Number 8

July 1979

For professionals in Public Agricultural and Food Price and Income Policy Research,
Teaching, Extension, Policymaking

INTRODUCTION

Public policy is as old as are nations with participatory governmental decision-making processes. It is as new as an action yesterday by some local, state, or federal policy making body. Information about policy developments which are both that old and that recent is needed by policy workers to be productive, accurate, and relevant. Much of this knowledge will come from other professional workers. The objective of this newsletter is to help provide this communication linkage among those on the *Policy Workers List* and others interested. Requests for copies of earlier issues of these *Notes* and for the latest *Policy Workers List*, and comments or suggestions about them, may be sent to either address below.

Contents of this issue

Page

Announcements of Policy Activities.....	2
An Update: Agricultural-Food Policy Decisions.....	6
Commentary: Economic Analysis and Politics in Agricultural Policymaking in the Executive Branch.....	13
News Items.....	19
Available Research Publications.....	23

Policy Research Notes is a cooperative effort of the North Central Regional Public Policy Research Committee and ESCS. The *Notes* are prepared by R. G. F. Spitze, 305 Mumford Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801, and Cecil W. Davison, ESCS, 500 12th Street S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Agricultural and Food Policy Issues, 1981

Extension educational materials on farm, agricultural, and food policy issues are being prepared by a national steering committee and invited authors. The initial publication, scheduled for January 1980, will include a discussion of the major issues to be considered when new legislation is enacted to replace the 1977 Food and Agriculture Act which will expire in 1981. The project is sponsored by the National Public Policy Education Committee. Authors were selected from Land Grant Universities, USDA, and congressional Committee staff. Further information about the project may be obtained from Norbert A. Dorow (Steering Committee Chairman), Extension Economist, North Dakota State University, Fargo, North Dakota 58105.

1979 Public Policy Education Conference

The Conference, planned by the National Public Policy Education Committee, will be held September 17-21, 1979, at Provincetown, Massachusetts. The theme is "Controlling Inflation Without Recession." This twenty-ninth Conference is the next edition of the longest known continuous educational program of national significance focusing primarily on public agricultural and food policy issues.

For more information, contact the Farm Foundation, 1211 West 22nd Street, Oak Brook, Illinois 60521, or the Policy Extension Specialist in your State.

Texas Farm Summit Proceedings Soon Available

The papers and proceedings of the National Farm Summit at Texas A&M University (December, 1978) will be published by the Texas A&M University Press this Fall. The book, *Economic Issues in U.S. Agriculture*, includes the formal presentation of the five task force reports as well as summaries of comments from the audience and a policy statement from the American Agriculture Movement. Topics featured in these reports were: resource allocation and production costs, farm commodity prices and incomes, international trade, nutrition safety and food quality, and agriculture's

role in government decisions.

Inquire from publisher, Texas A&M University Press, or editors, Bruce Gardner and James Richardson, Department of Agricultural Economics, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843.

Task Force Prepares Leaflets on Tobacco Policy

A joint tobacco marketing task force, composed of representatives from the Southern Extension Marketing Committee, Southern Extension Farm Management Committee and the Southern Extension Public Affairs Committee has developed six leaflets designed for tobacco leaders, public officials, lay people and professional groups interested in tobacco policy. The leaflets are titled: (1) History of Tobacco Control Programs and Marketing, (2) Current Issues Affecting the Program For and Marketing of Tobacco, (3) Provisions of the Current Tobacco Program, (4) Alternatives Regarding Production Controls and Price Supports for Tobacco, (5) The Present Tobacco Marketing System, and (6) Tobacco Marketing Alternatives.

These leaflets will be published in September 1979. Further information regarding the leaflets may be obtained from Paxton Marshall, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061.

USDA Decision Calendar

This calendar, published as the "Semiannual Agenda of Regulations" in the May 15, 1979 *Federal Register*, lists all significant program decisions pending or to be initiated during the following 6 months. The next release is scheduled for November 15, 1979. Each entry includes title of action, authority, brief description, projected decision dates, and agency contact for further information. A limited number of free copies are available or consult a library copy of the *Federal Register*.

Request from Linley E. Juers, Acting Associate Director, Office of Budget, Planning and Evaluation, USDA, Washington, D.C. 20250.

Newsletter Begins on International Food Policy

Commencing with Volume 1, Number 1, May 1, 1979, *IFPRI REPORT* made its debut as

a three issue per year newsletter focusing on international food policy problems, research, publications, and activities. Published by the International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C., the newsletter reports on IFPRI accomplishments and events related to its work. Each issue will also present a brief commentary from a staff member on a food policy issue of current interest to the Institute. The initial commentary was "Food Security--Failing the Test," by John W. Mellor, Institute Director.

The International Food Policy Research Institute was established in 1975 following a recommendation to the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research by its Technical Advisory Committee. It was funded by the International Development Research Centre of Canada, the Ford Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation. The Institute is not formerly linked but reports to the Consultative Group, which oversees the several international commodity-oriented research centers and recognizes the autonomy of the Institute to engage in socioeconomic studies. The senior research staff now numbers 21.

To be placed on the mailing list, write: *IFPRI REPORT*, International Food Policy Research Institute, 1776 Massachusetts Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

FOOD ISSUES UPDATE Ceases Publication

For the past 3 years, policy workers across the nation have benefited from the newsletter, *Food Issues Update*, published several times each year by the Food Staff of the U.S. General Accounting Office. It provided information about the different Federal actions dealing with food, agriculture, and nutrition for farmers, industry, labor, consumers, and government. It also offered a current concise summary of the status of legislation in those subject areas at the various policy making stages in the U.S. Congress.

Food Issues Update ceased on January 30, 1979. It will be missed by policy workers in the agricultural and food area.

National Educational Trade Effort Issues Leaflets

As reported in recent issues of these *Notes*, the second product of the national extension Foreign Trade Policy Project has just been released. *Speaking of Trade--Key Issues for Agriculture*, Minnesota Agricultural Extension Service Special Report No. 74, 1979, is a series of six leaflets dealing with: 1. Why Trade; 2. Protection or Free Trade; 3. The Balance of Payments; 4. Commodity Marketing and World Trade; 5. International Marketing Alternatives; 6. Expanding Trade. This series should interest a wide audience, particularly producers of internationally traded commodities. Authors were economists at Land Grant Universities and USDA. The project is under the direction of a National Public Policy Education Committee chaired by Martin K. Christiansen, 217 COB Classroom Office Building, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota 55108.

For availability of this series of trade leaflets, and possible cost, contact the Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service of your Land Grant University.

AGRICULTURAL-FOOD POLICY DECISIONS: AN UPDATE

by

Cecil W. Davison

Since the January 1977 *PRN* review of policy decisions a number of significant actions have been taken in the public policy arena to influence the course of U.S. agriculture. The following review updates that summary of important decisions made by the Administration and the Congress and concludes with a note on current policy issues being debated in the legislature.

Federal Executive Implementation

<u>Commodity Programs</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>
Wheat			
Target price (\$ per bu.)	2.90 <u>1/</u>	3.40	3.40
Loan level (\$ per bu.)	2.25 <u>2/</u>	2.35 <u>3/</u>	2.35 <u>2/</u>
Set-aside (percent)	---	20	20
Diversion (percent)	---	---	---
Voluntary reduction (percent)	---	20	15
National allotment (mil. acres)	62.2	---	---
National program acreage (mil. acres)	---	58.8	57.1
Corn			
Target price (\$ per bu.)	2.00 <u>1/</u>	2.10	2.20
Loan level (\$ per bu.)	2.00 <u>2/</u>	2.00 <u>3/</u>	2.00 <u>2/</u>
Set-aside (percent)	---	10	10
Diversion (percent)	---	10	10
Diversion payment (\$ per bu.)	---	.20	.10
Voluntary reduction (percent)	---	5	10
National program acreage (mil. acres) <u>4/</u>	---	76.2	63.7
Sorghum			
Target price (\$ per bu.)	2.28	2.28	2.34
Loan level (\$ per bu.)	1.90	1.90	1.90
Set-aside (percent)	---	10	10
Diversion (percent)	---	10	10
Diversion payment (\$ per bu.)	---	.12	.10
Voluntary reduction (percent)	---	5	10
National program acreage (mil. acres) <u>4/</u>	---	13.7	13.2
Barley			
Target price (\$ per bu.)	2.15	2.25	2.40
Loan level (\$ per bu.)	1.63	1.63	1.63
Set-aside (percent)	---	10	20
Diversion (percent)	---	10	---
Diversion payment (\$ per bu.)	---	.12	---
Voluntary reduction (percent)	---	20	30
National program acreage (mil. acres) <u>4/</u>	---	7.5	6.5
Oats			
Loan level (\$ per bu.)	1.03	1.03	1.03

	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>
Rye			
Loan level (\$ per bu.)	1.70	1.70	1.70
Soybeans			
Loan level (\$ per bu.)	3.50	4.50	4.50
Upland cotton			
Target price (cents per lb.)	47.80 <u>1/</u>	52.00 <u>2/</u>	57.70 <u>5/</u>
Loan level (cents per lb.) <u>1/</u>	44.63	48.00	50.23
Set-aside (percent)	---	---	---
Diversion (percent)	---	10	---
Diversion payment (cents per lb.)	---	2.0	---
Voluntary reduction (percent)	---	20	15
National allotment (mil. acres)	11.0 <u>2/</u>	---	---
National program acreage (mil. acres)	---	10.2	10.6
Extra long staple (ELS) cotton			
Loan level (cents per lb.) <u>2/</u>	76.70	83.20	92.95
National marketing quota (1,000 bales)	113	97	137
National acreage allotment (1,000 acres)	120.0	92.4	115.0
Rice			
Target price (\$ per cwt.) <u>1/</u>	8.25	8.53	9.05
Loan level (\$ per cwt.) <u>1/</u>	6.19	6.40	6.79
Set-aside (percent)	---	---	---
Diversion (percent)	---	---	---
National allotment (mil. acres) <u>1/</u>	1.8	1.8	1.8
Sugar			
Loan level (cents per lb., raw value)	13.50	14.73	13.00
Flue-cured tobacco			
Loan level (cents per lb.) <u>1/</u>	113.8	121.0	129.3
Effective marketing quota (mil. lb.)	1,197	1,181	1,070
Effective national allotment (1000 acres)	636	624	577
Burley tobacco			
Loan level (cents per lb.) <u>1/</u>	117.3	124.7	133.3
Effective marketing quota (mil. lb.)	684	651	650
Peanuts			
Loan level, quota peanuts (\$ per ton) <u>2/</u>	410.50 <u>6/</u>	420	420
Loan level, non-quota peanuts (\$ per ton)	---	250	300
Marketing quota (1,000 tons) <u>2/</u>	2,069	1,680	1,596
Acreage allotment (1,000 acres) <u>2/</u>	1,614	1,614	1,614
Flaxseed			
Support level (\$ per bu.)	---	4.50	4.50
Wool			
Support level (cents per lb.) <u>1/</u>	99	108	115
Mohair			
Support level (cents per lb.) <u>2/</u>	149.8	164.7	194.3

	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>
Gum naval stores			
Support price for gum rosin (\$ per cwt)	16.75	---	---
Loan level for gum rosin (\$ per cwt)	---	21.40	23.75
Honey			
Loan level (cents per lb.) <u>2/</u>	32.7	36.8	43.9

1/ Set by law.

2/ Minimum allowed by law.

3/ Under provisions of the 1977 Act the Secretary could have lowered the loan level for 1978 wheat and corn because the average market price received by farmers in the 1977 crop year did not exceed 105 percent of the loan.

4/ The national acreage allotment for 1977 crop feed grains was 89 million acres.

5/ Preliminary.

6/ Support level of \$430.50 minus \$20 per ton deducted for storage, handling, and inspection costs.

Dairy price support. Effective October 1, 1977, the support price for manufacturing milk was set at \$8.79 per hundredweight for milk containing 3.5 percent milkfat (82.3 percent of parity as of that date). The support level was raised to \$9.21 effective April 1, 1978, and to \$9.64 on October 1, 1978 (80 percent of parity).

Special grazing and hay program. A special grazing and hay program for 1978-crop wheat went into effect March 29, 1978, paying producers to reduce their grain harvest. February 23, 1979, the Secretary proposed a special grazing and hay program for the 1979 wheat crop; that program commenced March 15. Under its provisions wheat grazed or cut for hay qualifies for the same deficiency payment rate as wheat harvested for grain. Unlike the 1978 program, this one offers neither advance payment nor minimum payment guarantee.

Loan Programs

Commodity loans. Effective April 1, 1977, the interest rate on Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) outstanding 1974-76 crop commodity loans was reduced from 7.5 to 6 percent. Loans for 1977 crops would carry the 6-percent rate.

Beginning November 7, 1977, the CCC loan period for 1977 grain and soybean crops was changed from 11 to 9 months following the month of disbursement. Reducing the maturity period increased the number of loans expiring before the feed grain and soybean harvest the following fall, thus allowing 1977 crops to be moved from farm and country warehouse storage earlier to accommodate the 1978 crops.

On June 13, 1978, the CCC raised its interest rate from 6 percent to 7 percent on loans for all 1978 grain crops. The rate was boosted to reflect the increased cost of money the CCC borrows from the U.S. Treasury.

Interest rates on 1978 crop upland cotton loans were lowered from 7-3/4 to 7 percent on October 3, 1978. The action followed an amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949 deleting the provision requiring the quarterly establishment of the interest rate on cotton loans by CCC on the basis of the lowest current interest rate on ordinary obligations of the United States. The amendment permits the CCC to charge the same interest rate on all commodity loans. The 7-3/4 percent rate for upland cotton had been

in effect since July 26, 1978.

On May 22, 1979, the interest rate for CCC loans on 1979 crops was set at 9 percent.

Farm facility loans. Interest rates on farm storage and drying facility loans were reduced on April 1, 1977, from 7.5 to 7 percent. The maximum loan amount was raised from \$25,000 to \$50,000, and the 30-percent downpayment requirement was lowered to 15 percent.

On August 25, 1977, the repayment schedule for new farm facility loans was lengthened from 5 years to a maximum of 8.

On March 21, 1979, interest rates were raised on the following: farm storage facility loans to 10.5 percent, Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) farm real estate loans to 9 percent, and FmHA operating loans to 9.5 percent.

Farmer-owned reserve. On April 4, 1977, the Secretary announced a farmer-owned food grain reserve program, effected by a 3-year extension of loans for 1976-crop wheat and rice. The Commodity Credit Corporation would pay annual storage in advance at the rate of 20 cents per bushel for wheat and 65 cents per hundredweight for rice. Farmers could repay the loans without penalty after the national average market price reached 140 percent of the current national loan rate, or when the contract expired. Storage credit would end when the 140-percent market price level was reached. USDA would call in all wheat and rice loans when the market price reached 175 percent of the current national loan level.

The Administration announced August 29, 1977, a comprehensive plan to place 30 to 35 million metric tons of food and feed grains in reserve prior to the beginning of the 1978/79 marketing year, including a proposal that Congress create a special International Emergency Food Reserve of up to 6 million tons.

The farmer-owned reserve was opened to 1976- and 1977-crop feed grains and to 1977-crop wheat on December 6.

On February 6, 1978, the Administration announced that the farmer-owned reserve would be opened on March 1 to 1977-crop barley, oats, and wheat, without awaiting maturation of the CCC loans on those crops. Two days later the Government storage payments for wheat, corn, sorghum, and barley were raised from 20 to 25 cents per bushel; for oats, from 15 to 19 cents per bushel. The farm storage facility loan program was changed to allow reserve program participants to build structures with 2 years' production capacity.

On March 29 the Administration lifted its targets for the farmer-owned reserve, 330 million bushels of wheat by June 1 and 670 million bushels of feed grains (corn equivalent) by October 1, to enable the reserve to absorb not only excess 1977 production but that from 1978 as well. On that date the terms were liberalized to eliminate interest charges on grain in the reserve after the first year. Early entry of 1977-crop corn and sorghum was authorized effective May 1.

To help support farm prices and offer producers more flexibility in marketing alternatives, the loan maturity dates for 1977-crop corn and sorghum were extended 30 days on July 29, 1978. The CCC price support loan program for 1977-crop corn and sorghum was reopened for 2 months to allow farmers who had not previously done so to put their grain in the farmer-owned reserve.

Due to critical storage problems for corn in some areas, county ASCS offices were authorized on August 8 to increase producers' loans to help pay transportation costs involved in moving corn to available storage to qualify for the farmer-owned reserve.

On September 15, 1978, the Secretary authorized early maturity on 1977-crop corn loans and delivery to the CCC for farmers unable to use the reserve because of storage problems for the upcoming 1978 crop.

Rough rice from the 1978 crop was pronounced eligible for early entry into the farmer-owned reserve on September 20. Eligible producers receive an advance annual storage payment of 85 cents per hundredweight in addition to the \$6.40 per hundredweight loan. Interest, charged on the first year of the loan, is waived for the remainder of the period. The reserve ceiling is 8 million hundredweight.

Producers holding 1978-crop corn under CCC loans were permitted immediate entry of that grain into the farmer-owned reserve on October 5. The Secretary had announced August 7 he would permit early entry if it appeared by October 1 that the reserve goals would not be met from 1977 crops. Immediate entry for 1978-crop corn was terminated November 30 with attainment of the feed grain reserve target.

On March 21, 1979, the Secretary announced that the farmer-owned reserve will not be open to 1978-crop wheat, nor to any additional 1978-crop corn. Producers with 1978-crop wheat loans may get 6-month extensions to ease storage and transportation problems.

On June 18 farmers with 1978-crop barley were permitted to extend their CCC loans for 6 months, but the farmer-owned reserve was not opened to 1978-crop barley.

Although wheat, barley, and oats had previously been released from the reserve, all crops except rice were in release status in June. By the end of that month farmers had redeemed from the reserve 3 percent of the 732 million bushels of corn, 22 percent of the 413 million bushels of wheat, 5 percent of the 44.3 million hundredweight of sorghum, 1 percent of the 41.2 million bushels of barley, and 4 percent of the 39.3 million bushels of oats.

National average prices for oats and barley rose sufficiently to require USDA to call those crops from the farmer-owned reserve on June 26. (The call level for feed grains is 140 percent of the current loan level.) After a commodity is called, producers must repay their loans within 30 days or forfeit the grain to CCC.

International Trade

Food aid pledge doubled. The President raised the annual U.S. commitment to the Food Aid Convention (FAC) on March 3, 1978, from 1.89 million metric tons to 4.47. If other FAC donor countries collectively contribute more, the United States will increase its contribution on a matching ton-for-ton basis up to half of the annual 10-million ton global food target set by the World Food Conference in 1974.

More meat imports authorized. On June 8, 1978, the President increased the level of meat imports allowed for 1978 by 200 million pounds to help slow rising retail beef prices. This required renegotiation of the voluntary agreements negotiated earlier with 13 other nations which would have limited 1978 imports of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, mutton, and goat meat to 1.3 billion pounds.

Additional Soviet purchases allowed. The Soviet Union was informed October 11, 1978, that it could buy up to 15 million metric tons of U.S. grain for delivery during the year beginning October 1, 1978, without prior consultation. Under terms of the 5-year U.S.-Soviet Grain Supply Agreement, the Soviet Union would buy at least 6 million tons and could buy up to 8 million tons of U.S. grain annually. The assistant Secretary of Agriculture told the Russians that, given the current U.S. grain supply, more than 15 million tons could be available with consultations.

Trade agreements concluded. On April 12, 1979, representatives of 41 nations signed agreements in Geneva, concluding the Tokyo round of international trade talks that began in September 1973. When implemented, the multilateral trade negotiations (MTN) will reduce tariff and non-tariff barriers to international trade as well as strengthen the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in resolving trade disputes and providing a forum for increased cooperation.

Regulatory Actions

Dairy marketing year changed. The beginning of the dairy marketing year was changed from April 1 to October 1 effective October 1, 1977. As mandated by the 1977 Act, the milk price support level continues to be adjusted in the middle of the marketing year to reflect the estimated change in the parity index.

Stockyard fees deregulated. Effective October 6, 1978, stockyard operators may change their rates without the advance approval previously required. Operators must still file changes with USDA 10 days before implementing new rates.

Policy Through Legislation

Commodity Programs

Major 4-year bill adopted. On September 29, 1977, the President signed the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 (PL 95-113). For a discussion of the evolution, provisions, and implications of this Act see "The Food and Agriculture Act of 1977: Issues and Decisions" by R.G.F. Spitze in the May 1978 issue of *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, and articles in the *Agricultural-Food Policy Review*, AFPR-3, forthcoming from ESCS, USDA.

Limits on disaster payments abolished. H.R. 9090 was passed and approved in the fall of 1977, exempting disaster payments for 1977 wheat, feed grain, upland cotton, and rice crops from the program payment limits imposed by the 1973 Act and the Rice Act of 1975. Effects were estimated to be an additional \$25 to 30 million in Government disaster payments on 1977 crops.

Emergency legislation passed. The Senate approved the House-Senate conference report on the Emergency Agricultural Act of 1978 on May 2. The House added its endorsement by a 212 to 182 vote May 4, sending the bill, H.R. 6782, to the White House where President Carter signed it May 15 (PL 95-279). The Act establishes a floor of 48 cents a pound for CCC cotton loans and increases the CCC borrowing authority from \$14.5 to \$25 billion. It also gives the Secretary of Agriculture discretionary authority to raise target prices for wheat, feed grains, and upland cotton whenever a set-aside is in effect for one or more of these crops. (This authority was later extended by PL 95-334 to include rice.)

Credit Programs

Farm lending programs revised. The Agricultural Credit Act of 1978, signed into law (PL 95-334) August 4, provided farmers and rural communities \$4 billion of additional credit in loans made or guaranteed by the Farmers Home Administration. The new law has two main purposes: to authorize higher individual loans to farm operators and to stimulate commercial funding by guaranteeing commercial loans at current market interest rates.

Trade expansion bill enacted. The Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, signed into

law (PL 95-501) October 21, is designed to improve sales of U.S. farm commodities abroad by increasing and strengthening the tools available for market development.

Regulatory Actions

Foreign ownership to be disclosed. S. 3384, the Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act of 1978, became Public Law 95-460 October 14. The Act requires foreign parties owning U.S. agricultural land to report their holdings to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary will evaluate the effects of such foreign investment on family farms and rural communities.

Waterway user charges established. H.R. 8533 was signed into Public Law 95-502 October 21, 1978. The act authorizes replacement of Locks and Dam 26 at Alton, Illinois, and establishes the principle of user charges on inland waterways. A tax on fuel for barge transport, starting at 4 cents per gallon in 1980 and building to 10 cents a gallon by 1985, will be deposited in a trust fund for use in construction of new waterway projects. The act also requires a study to assess the impacts and effects of various types and levels of user charges.

Federal grazing fees increased. The President signed the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978 (H.R. 10587) into Public Law 95-514 October 25. Under a formula in the Act to bring grazing fees more into line with rates charged on comparable private grazing lands, the average fee increased from \$1.60 per animal unit month in 1978 to \$1.96 in 1979. The higher fees, announced by USDA April 27, 1979, affect national forests and land utilization projects in the following 16 States only: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

Legislative Policy Plans

Legislation introduced in the 96th Congress and under consideration this year includes some issues carried over from the 95th Congress: sugar legislation to implement the International Sugar Agreement and provide a domestic price support program; meat import legislation that includes a counter-cyclical formula for determining quotas and will set a minimum level for U.S. annual imports; a comprehensive crop insurance program to replace the disaster programs due to expire with the end of the 1979 crop year; and authorization of an emergency wheat reserve to guarantee U.S. food aid commitments.

Other agricultural legislation introduced this session and commanding attention includes: implementing the Multilateral Trade Negotiation (MTN) agreements to reduce tariff and non-tariff barriers to international trade; raising target prices and loan levels for crops; extending the current minimum dairy price support level (80 percent of parity) beyond its expiration date of October 1, 1979; deregulating the trucking industry; and encouraging the development and use of alternative energy sources including the production of alcohol from agricultural products.

COMMENTARY

Economic Analysis and Politics in Agricultural Policymaking in the Executive Branch

by

Bruce Gardner*

The remarks to follow are addressed chiefly to two related questions: How does the agriculture/food policy process work in the U.S. executive branch, and what is the role of economic analysis in that process? The ideas advanced (answers are not a possibility) result from observations as viewed from the Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) during 1975-77.

Who Makes Decisions on Agriculture/Food Issues

If a specialist is someone who learns more and more about less and less, the President of the United States is our Chief Generalist. The trend is for the President to be asked to make more and more decisions. Given the inevitable time constraints, he has to make decisions on subjects about which he knows less and less. It is astounding that we call upon one person, in the last analysis, to make the decisions for annual budget outlays in the neighborhood of half a trillion dollars. The job is so much bigger than that of even the largest corporate chief executive that it defies comparison.

The demands upon the Presidency are intensified by a tendency in Congress to defer difficult decisions. Thus, Congress has agreed to provide the U.S. beef industry modest protection against imports, but has recognized that in at least some circumstances this protection would not be in the national interest. Being unable to specify what these circumstances are, Congress in the Meat Import Act of 1964 empowers the President to make the determination.

Similarly, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 and preceding permanent legislation grant the Secretary of Agriculture wide discretionary powers. For example, the action taken in 1979 to strengthen the price of potatoes by Government purchase and diversion of potatoes to livestock feeding was essentially an executive branch initiative. Even decisions explicitly delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture often involve White House decisionmaking. The Secretary is after all the President's employee, and his decisions have to fit in with the President's program as a whole. There is a desire to help the potato industry by raising prices but also a desire to fight inflation by not raising them. Resolving the issue involves difficult analytical questions such as whether supporting the price of potatoes in 1979 can usefully head off cobweb adjustments that would otherwise yield instability and higher prices in 1980 or 1981. The point of these observations is simply this: There is a strong demand for decisionmaking at the Presidential level, and it is a demand for making especially difficult decisions.

How can such demands be met most effectively? It goes without saying that Presidential attention must be directed first and foremost at the jobs most vital to the

*Professor of Agricultural Economics, Texas A&M University, and former Senior Staff Economist, President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Nation that will not be done unless the President does them. Thus, issues of international affairs and national defense come to the fore. Within the realm of economics, the first order of priority is necessarily the macroeconomic issues--issues concerning the nation's rate of inflation, unemployment, and economic growth.

Where do agricultural and food issues fit in to executive branch decisionmaking? There are two countervailing forces. First, agriculture in and of itself is becoming less and less important, both economically and politically. But second, agriculture is becoming more and more integrated with other economic and political areas, and is therefore a matter of broader concern. For example, food and agriculture are of greater importance in international affairs, and hence of greater interest to the State Department, than once was the case. The Treasury Department, the Justice Department, the Council on Wage and Price Stability, and the Labor Department have also seen reasons to want to increase their input into agricultural policymaking.

The net result of both forces is that agricultural policy issues are delegated to the sub-Presidential, even sub-Cabinet level for their main analysis and all but the most important and difficult decisionmaking. But the Department of Agriculture works out less and less well as the appropriate sub-Presidential issue agency because of the multiplicity of interests involved. This tends to make the White House staff a focal point for executive branch discussion of food and agricultural policy. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Council of Economic Advisers (CEA), the parts of the Executive Office of the President with general interest in the budgetary and economic consequences of policy action, also tend to become involved.

The preceding statements evoke the idea that there has emerged a new process of agricultural and food policy determination in the past few years. This idea is not, however, verifiable by simple observation. It is a theory. The *Progressive Farmer* in November 1977 carried an article called "Four People Who Can Make or Break Farm Prices", referring to staff members in the State Department, the Treasury Department, and the Council of Economic Advisers. From my acquaintance with these people and their positions, the hypothesis that they had an influence on farm prices is dubious. It is unquestionably true that meetings have been held outside the Department of Agriculture at which food issues were discussed. Interagency groups have met and thrashed things out. However, the relationship between these meetings and governmental action subsequently undertaken is a matter of speculation, of theory.

The systematic explanation of executive branch decisionmaking would require a difficult piece of social science research. Certainly one cannot rely on organizational charts and the like. If an effective new policy process has come into existence one has to be able to show that decisions today turn out differently than they would have under former institutional arrangements.

Determinants of Policy Choice

While it is difficult to determine exactly who, if anyone, is "the decisionmaker" in policy choices, there is a view according to which this is not an important matter anyway. The question of why policy decisions are made the way they are may turn not on who makes them but on forces in the society of which the nominal decisionmaker is merely the vehicle of expression.

Politics vs. Economics

Among the substantive factors determining policy, one broad dichotomy is "political" as opposed to "economic" factors. This distinction is not as clearcut as it may at first appear. Nonetheless, one can at least distinguish superficially between actions

taken in pursuit of votes in the next election and actions taken in pursuit of the Nation's general economic welfare. There is, of course, no reason why the two objectives must lead to conflicting policy choices. Indeed, one could not feel very good about democracy as a form of government if one thought that pleasing the voters leads systematically to unwise decisions. Even so, there do seem to be occasions when unwise decisions somehow are made, and these occasions are often connected with the pursuit of votes.

Consider two kinds of executive branch decisions: (1) Should the President veto or sign legislation which comes from Congress as an "enrolled bill"; (2) When should the President exercise authority to make major changes in existing legislation? Following are a few examples under each category.

Decisions on new legislation. Presidential decisions on bills passed by Congress have long been handled in an institutionally formalized framework in which the OMB coordinates agency comments and forwards the results to the White House. Some of the difficulties of decision here arise from the Congressional policy process, which is not the main subject of this commentary.* Of the several ways in which the thrust of Congressional action may be oversimplified, I like the image of Congress basically slicing up a pie. The U.S. economy is a \$2 trillion pie, and we have over 200 million people more or less intensively struggling to increase the size of their pieces. Congress is a means by which organized groups of citizens attempt to increase their shares, or to prevent others from decreasing them. Thus, while we may give an economic-theory rationale for Congress to ban futures trading in potatoes, for example, the reason this becomes a legislative matter is the strong feeling of an organized group that they would do better financially without the futures market.

During the 6-week period prior to the 1976 election, three enrolled bills of interest to agriculture came to the White House: (i) The Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act, (ii) The Emergency Livestock Credit Act, and (iii) The Grain Standards Act. All three bills were typical in that they responded to a felt need from a body of constituents, but in attempting to meet that need proposed measures that involved questionable expenditure of taxpayers' money and possibly important incentives for inefficiency. Certainly it was not demonstrable that the Nation's general interest was well served by any of the three.

The political point is that the proximity of the 1976 election affected the treatment of these bills. Judging from the track record of the budget-conscious administration at that time, it might have been expected that at least one, probably two, and perhaps all three would have been vetoed. But with the election impending, the President's political advisers could not afford the risk of antagonizing the supporters of these bills, and so all three were signed and became law. 1/

*Editor's note: For a description of the Congressional policymaking process, see Allen Grommet's commentary "Congressional Action on the 1977 Farm Bill" in the January 1978 PRN.

1/ I do not know of careful studies of the actual effects of these pieces of legislation. The ratio of benefits to costs of The Direct Marketing Act seems unlikely to have been high, if positive at all. The Emergency Livestock Credit Act undoubtedly helped some farmers who were severely affected by drought in the Upper Midwest, but the hay transportation subsidy title in the Act appeared at the time to be an activity of dubious social value, with great incentives for misuse and waste. A Grain Standards Act was probably inevitable and warranted, given the scandals in the inspection of grain for export, but the bill as put together was loosely stated--following the common congressional procedure of instructing the executive branch to solve difficult problems without clear instructions on how to do it--and had many

Decisions under existing laws. The period immediately prior to the 1976 election offers two telling examples of the role of political calculation in economic policy decisions. These are the decisions to raise the loan rate on wheat from \$1.50 to \$2.25 per bushel, and to triple the tariff on imported sugar from .625 to 1.875 cents per pound.

Both of these were economically important measures, more so than the three bills just discussed. Policy in both areas had been the subject of long and intensive discussion within interagency groups such as the Agricultural Policy Review Group which contained representatives from USDA, OMB, CEA, State, Treasury, and other departments. Yet the deliberations of these groups seems to have had virtually no impact on the decisions made. Higher-level economic advisers may have given some economic advice on the issues, but the decisions were basically political ones, and would not have been made had the election not loomed so large in White House thinking.

In contrast to the situation prior to the election, economic analysis played a greater role in the executive branch in preliminary work in 1977 on the set of programs that was to become the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977. Here USDA background work and interagency discussion, through analysis and resolution of conflicting claims and interests, resulted in an original Carter Administration proposal that could possibly have constituted the economically most satisfactory farm legislation in 40 years. Nonetheless, the political component of subsequent congressional action on the proposals, and the changes later introduced in the Emergency Act of 1978 and the Administration's adoption of set-asides, largely dissipated the gains in economic rationality.

Theories of Political Choice

Beyond the issue of politics versus economics, a number of more general hypotheses have been put forth which have some relevance for agricultural and food policymaking. These include the following:

- (1) Those policy decisions are made which, after analysis of the situation, promote the general well-being of the country. (The Civics-Class image.)
- (2) Executive-branch administrators (or independent regulatory Authorities or members of Congress) are beholden to special interests and make those policy decisions which, after analysis of the situation, best promote that special interest. (The Capture Theory.)
- (3) Policy decisions are made which reflect the wishes of voters as expressed at the ballot box, but those wishes reflect narrow special interests, not large general interests.
- (4) No one can control the executive branch and Regulatory officials, who take the vague orders they receive in legislation and make such decisions as best serve their agency's interests. (The Dominant-Bureaucracy Theory.)
- (5) Points 2, 3, and 4 can be combined into the idea that a "triangle of power", consisting of congressional committees, special interest lobbyists, and executive

dubious provisions. As it turned out, it was necessary in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 to include a substantial section (Title 16) which contains a long list of technical amendments intended to make sense out of the Grain Standards Act (and also to make the Act more palatable to the grain trade by shifting some inspection costs from the grain trade to the general taxpayer).

administrative agencies, controls regulatory governmental action to the benefit of the industry regulated. (The Golden Triangle Theory.)

While these and other theories can aid in understanding governmental action, I would emphasize the extreme difficulty of explaining policy decisions in any meaningful sense. Suppose, for example, that one desired to explain why the 1977 Act provided a \$3.05 target price for wheat if production were less than 1.8 billion bushels and a \$3.00 target price if production were greater than 1.8 billion bushels. Hypotheses (1) - (5) would not help. One would have to dig into the details of the process to see why Senator Humphrey came up with this idea in the Conference Committee's deliberations. The point is that this outcome would show up in an attempt at hypothesis testing as random error. There would likely be a large random component in trying to explain why the Carter Administration raised the wheat target price to \$3.40 after approving the Emergency Agricultural Act of 1978, or why the Ford Administration raised the wheat loan rate to \$2.25 in 1976. Hypothesis: there is as much randomness in policy choice as in the most uncertain agricultural production processes.

It is true that after the fact one can often give a deterministic explanation of the policy choice made. Indeed, the major problem is overdetermination; one can cite cost of production increases, American Agriculture Movement goats on the Capitol steps, the political situation in Kansas, and so on, in explaining the \$3.40 wheat target price. But no one could have predicted it, say, 6 months in advance. Ex post political determinism is a scientifically suspect enterprise.

A more fundamental difficulty in explaining policy is the specification of the dependent variable. Economists in the past decade have become attached to the phrase "public choice" in their thinking about political action. One can, with some stretching of the term, treat voting by the public or voting in Congress as acts of decision by the citizenry. The range of governmental action is narrowed, but not usually determined by these decisions. Many of the real "public choices" in farm programs as in other areas are made in the executive branch. But how and by whom the choice is made is no easy matter to determine, as discussed earlier. While the President is the ultimate decisionmaker, in specific areas such as agriculture the decisions in many cases are made de facto by subordinates. Moreover, governmental action is not determined in any single decision. For example, in tripling the sugar tariff, the decision was announced, but industry difficulties with the technicalities resulted in successive changes in and reinterpretations of the executive order implementing it.

The public decision process can be thought of as follows. Initially, there is a wide range of possible programs for, say, intervention in the wheat market. The probability distribution of outcomes is narrowed by the voters' choice of Congresspeople. It is further narrowed in the give and take within the Congress that results in an actual piece of legislation. The executive branch then narrows the range of concrete program options at the technical staff level, interagency disputes are passed up to higher sub-cabinet or cabinet-level decision points, and those that are both irreconcilable and important enough go to the President. Then after a concrete choice is made, the courts or executive branch or Congress can respond to citizens' reaction by further revision. Some courses of governmental action are ruled out at each stage. But in this narrowing down, the participants at each stage of the process are aware of the other stages; for example, White House staff people know what the President's general views are, and hence, it is often quite impossible to specify a locus of public choice more precise than "the U.S. Government in Washington."

These difficulties do not imply that any attempt to explain policy is foredoomed. The hypotheses listed above do contain valuable insights, although hypothesis (4) seems to me oversold among economists and hypothesis (1) unjustly underrated. What happens in the executive branch is not badly characterized, I believe, as a serious

effort to make decisions that will be best for the country. Hypotheses (2, (3), and (4) do come into play, but do not dominate the process (although hypothesis (3) may dominate the congressional process). The many decisions that do not turn out well result as much from the difficulty of the problems addressed as from unfortunate criteria for policy choice.

The preceding point leads us back to the role of economic analysis in agricultural policymaking. There has been an undeniable increase in demand for economic analysts of food and agriculture in Washington. One may question whether this reflects a genuine thirst for analysis or merely a desire to field the most scientifically respectable arguments possible in favor of agencies' preconceived positions. It seems clear however, that at least some of the former motivation exists. There is a genuine desire to be able to forecast the consequences of governmental action, and a recognition that such forecasts are difficult and require real analytical skill, not just skill in rhetoric. And I believe that improved analytical capabilities have already had payoffs. For example, both the executive and legislative branches have been able to respond more intelligently to recent proposals for drastic changes in farm commodity programs because of the accumulation of analytical work on the consequence of policy alternatives. In contrast, the knowledge base for making intelligent decisions in the newer food regulatory areas is much weaker. But here, too, a real and increasing demand for analysis is apparent.

POLICY RESEARCH NEWS ITEMS

(projects and activities as submitted)

Ten Years of Public Subsidization in the Agriculture of Spain

This study provides a historical and current evaluation of subsidies and other payments and transfers as instruments of agricultural policy in Spain.

Inquire about above study and request related report entitled, "Aspectos Regionales de las Subvenciones en la Agricultura Espanola," by Alfredo Cadenas and Ciriaco Vazquez, of the Universidad Autonoma, by contacting Alfredo Cadenas, Plaza Cancilleria 4, Madrid 8, Spain.

Food, Health, and Farming in the U.K.

Research panels have developed reports on the relationships between dietary changes and agriculture. The panels, focusing on fats, cereals, fruits and vegetables, and sweeteners, studied the effects of health-related dietary changes on the food supply and agriculture of the United Kingdom.

Inquire about this research and request information about the report by the above title (cost 2.40 pound sterling) from C. J. Robbins, Centre for Agricultural Strategy, University of Reading, Reading RG6 2AU, United Kingdom.

Task Force II Cites New Directions for U.S. Food Assistance

As mandated in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977, a Special Task Force of USDA analyzed the operations and management of PL 480. The 268-page final report of the Task Force provides an in-depth analysis of operations and management within the policy context of global food aid needs and domestic economic and political considerations. Specific recommendations were made for changes in policy, programming, and management.

Inquire about this effort from Brady J. Deaton (who was a leader in the work), Department of Agricultural Economics, VPI and SU, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061.

Request copy of the report, *New Directions for U.S. Food Assistance: A Report of the Special Task Force on the Operation of Public Law 480* from Thomas Lederer, Office of Secretary, Office of International Cooperation and Development, 143 W. Administration Bldg., USDA, Washington, D.C. 20250.

Effects of Recent Changes in the Food Stamp Program

The impact of recent changes in the Food Stamp Program on participation by public assistance recipients, the working poor, students and senior citizens is being assessed based on interviews with residents of rural areas and small towns in Tompkins County, New York. Particular attention is being paid to the "money management" problems of participants and on changes in food purchases resulting from the elimination of the cash purchase requirement.

Inquire about this research from Deborah Morentz, Department of Agricultural Economics, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853.

Effects of Food Programs on Nutrient Intake of Children

For school children in the State of Washington, participants in the school

lunch program had higher intakes of 5 of 10 nutrients than non or partial-participants. Nutrient intakes of food stamp recipients were not significantly higher than for other school children in the sample.

Inquire about this research and request related article, "Food Delivery Programs and Other Factors Affecting Nutrient Intake of Children," (AJAE), from David W. Price, Department of Agricultural Economics, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington 99164.

Small Farms Research Agenda

An agenda for further research is now being developed by building upon a series of state-of-the-arts review papers commissioned for the recent (January 31-February 2) Small Farms Conference in Lincoln, Nebraska, sponsored by the National Rural Center. This is phase III of a national project on public policy related to small farms.

Inquire about the progress of this project and request a relevant paper entitled "Agricultural Mechanization and the Family Farm--Some Social and Economic Consequences," from J. Patrick Madden, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, 104 Weaver Building, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802.

Models Examine the Viability of Small Farms

Two computer simulation models have been developed to explore the interaction of factors that force small farmers out of the industry. Wheat farmers in the Midwest and dairy farmers in Vermont were the subject of two studies carried out by Dartmouth's Resource Policy Center. The analysis suggests that the reform of property taxes will not arrest the decline in farm numbers. Direct controls over size of holding or production levels may be necessary.

Inquire about this research from Brzyzowski and Budzik, Resource Policy Center, Box 8000, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755, and request copies of the two reports from the Publications Office at the above address.

The American Agricultural Movement

Researchers at Central Michigan University and the University of Nebraska are doing an analysis of the birth and development of AAM. The focus of the work is on the organizational aspects of the Movement, with some attention also directed to its political impact.

Inquire about this study and request a relevant paper entitled, "The American Agriculture Movement: What Is It and Why?" from its author and one of the researchers, William P. Browne, Department of Political Science, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, Michigan 48859.

Impact of American Agricultural Movement on Other Farm Organizations

This study involved a general review of the origin and development of the AAM, and an appraisal of the impact of the movement on membership, leadership, and policy positions of other major farmer organizations in the U.S.

Inquire about this effort and request a copy of a paper by the above title from D. Milton Shuffett, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40546.

Policy Options for Pricing Problems of the Meat Industry

Two recent studies have been completed on beef and pork pricing systems. They also consider policy options for this part of the livestock industry, now being debated within USDA and Congress.

Inquire about these studies from Marvin L. Hayenga, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin, 905 University Avenue, Room 209, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.

Request related publication from above author: "Formula Pricing and Price Reporting Problems in the Markets for Beef and Pork." NC-117 Working Paper WP-32, May 1979.

Analysis of Dairy Price Supports and Alternate Support Policies

In this analysis the impacts on producers, consumers, and the government of alternate support policies are estimated for 1977-1981 using a quarterly, spatial model of the dairy sector. Policies evaluated include various levels of support prices based on parity, support prices at 80 percent of parity with reduced Class I differentials, support prices based on cost of production, and no supports.

Inquire about this analysis from Andrew Novakovic, Department of Agricultural Economics, 312 Warren Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853.

Request from above researcher the following publications for which he is sole or senior author: (1) "An Economic Analysis of the U.S. Dairy Price Support Program and Alternate Policies," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, May 1979; (2) "An Abridged Summary of 'An Economic Analysis of the U.S. Dairy Price Support Program and Alternate Policies'," unpublished paper, February 1979; (3) "An Analysis of U.S. Dairy Price Supports Based on Parity Versus Cost of Production," Staff Paper No. 79-6, Department of Agricultural Economics, Cornell University, April 1979; (4) "Input Forms and Output From the Dairy Market Policy Simulator (Model A)," Staff Paper No. 79-5, Department of Agricultural Economics, Cornell University, May 1979, and (5) "Base Support Prices on Production Costs?" *Hoard's Dairyman*, Vol. 124, No. 10, May 25, 1979.

Status of Agricultural Bargaining

A study has been made of push-pull factors and forces affecting agricultural bargaining, including enacted and pending legislation, court decisions, commission findings, agricultural programs, and agricultural organizational positions and efforts.

Inquire about this work from Truman Graf, Room 316 Agriculture Hall, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.

Request related publication from above author: "Agricultural Bargaining--Forward or Backward?" *Economic Issues*, No. 35, July 1979, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin.

Integrating Conservation and Price Supporting: A Policy Alternative

A "Conservation Incentive Program" is described, modifying the compliance provisions in ASCS commodity price and production control programs. The basic policy change being proposed involves specification of conserving BMP's rather than acreage set-asides. Complimentary interrelationships between the conservation and conventional policy objectives are stressed.

Inquire about this proposal and request relevant paper from Charles Benbrook, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin, 1450 Linden Drive, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.

Agricultural and Environmental Relationships: Issues and Priorities

A report and selected readings relating to this subject were prepared by several congressional research staff members for the relevant House and Senate Committees, and subsequently issued as a committee print. The text and appended readings illustrate advantages of a symbiotic relationship between agriculture and the environment.

Inquire about this research and request a copy of the print from Joseph Biniek, ENR, CRS, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540.

Federal Land Use Policy: Improving Citizen Participation

A SEA-Extension Special Needs Project has focused on opportunities and methods for improving citizen participation in federal land use policy formulation. The objectives are to develop educational materials to facilitate communication between concerned user groups and improve the effectiveness of their participation.

Inquire about the project from Tiff Harris, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon 97331.

Policy Implications of Wood as a Source of Energy

A research group of 20 analysts is pursuing a diverse set of studies on the current and future use of wood as fuel. One task force designated POWER (Potential of Wood Energy Resources) has released 13 technical reports. Forest biomass and crop residues can be a source of fuel and a source of farm family income. They also could compete with resources for the production of food and industrial crops.

Inquire about this research group and their projects from Dennis Meadows, Resource Policy Center, Thayer School of Engineering, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755.

Request list of available reports from this Center and costs of each from Publications Office at above address.

North Central Regional Policy Research Project Underway

Three phases of NC-152, "Economic Consequences of Selected Provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977," are in progress with participation from researchers in the North Central, West, South, and USDA: (1) "Food Stamp" (Kristin Kline, Virginia Polytechnic and State University, Coordinator) focuses on effects of program changes under the 1977 Act and involves a primary survey of households in four states in three regions of the nation; (2) "Grain Reserves" (Mary Ryan, University of Minnesota, Coordinator) focuses on experience of new grain reserve program under the 1977 Act and involves a primary survey of farmers in nine States; (3) "Policy Alternatives" (Bob Spitze, University of Illinois, Coordinator) focuses on problems and alternatives expected at expiration of the 1977 Act.

Inquire about this project from any of the above listed coordinators and from Marshall Martin, Project chairperson, Purdue University.

Recommendations for a New Hampshire Food Policy

This study grew out of an extension-research effort involving about 14 groups with a direct interest in food issues. The recommendations were reviewed by a statewide workshop convened by the Governor.

Inquire about this project and request a copy of the report by the same title from Lynda Brushett, Taylor Hall-University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire 03824.

POLICY RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE

(listed as submitted)

- BOEHM, WILLIAM T., MICHAEL BELONGIA, and MASAO MATSUMOTO. *An Analysis of Food Stamp Redemptions*. USDA, ESCS-55, May 1979.
Request report from Masao Matsumoto, NED, ESCS, USDA, Room 260, 500 12th Street S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250
- BOEHM, WILLIAM T., CLARK BURBEE, and WILLIAM GALLIMORE. *An Analysis of a Ban on Nitrite Use in Curing Bacon*. USDA, ESCS-48, March 1979.
Request report from ESCS Information, Room 0054 South Building, USDA, Washington, D.C. 20250.
- BOEHM, WILLIAM T., CLARK BURBEE, and WILLIAM GALLIMORE. *Nitrite in Bacon: A Summary Analysis of a Ban on the Use of Nitrite in Curing Bacon*. USDA, ESCS-44, December 1978.
Request from same source as previous entry.
- BOEHM, WILLIAM T. and RODNEY C. KITE. *Food Prices and Policy*. USDA, ESCS-59, July 1979.
Request from ESCS Information at address listed previously.
- BREIMYER, HAROLD F., ed. *Bargaining in Agriculture: Potentials and Pitfalls in Collective Action*. North Central Regional Extension Publication 30. Missouri Extension C 911, June 1971.
Request a copy or copies for use with groups from Harold F. Breimyer, Department of Agricultural Economics, 200 Mumford Hall, Columbia, Missouri 65201.
- CADENAS, ALFREDO. "Statutory and Associative Marketing in Agriculture: A Comparative International Approach." *Comunicacion INIA*.
Request copy of paper from Ramon Cadahia, INIA, c/o General P. Sanjurjo 52, Madrid, Spain.
- CAMPBELL, JOSEPH and EARL O. HEADY. "Potential Economic Impact of Different Environmental Policies."
Request paper from Earl O. Heady, 578 East Hall, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50010
- COLYER, DALE. "Taxation: A Land Use Issue in West Virginia." R.M. #65.
Request paper from Dale Colyer, Division of Resource Management, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia 26506.
- EMERSON, PETER M. *Public Policy and the Changing Structure of American Agriculture*. Congressional Budget Office, August 1978.
Request monograph from author, 2nd and D Streets S.W., Congressional Budget Office, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C. 20515.
- HAWKINS, M. H. "The Competitive Environment in the Canadian Food System." *Rural Economy*, University of Alberta.
Request the above paper from author, Department of Rural Economy, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, T6G 2H1.

- HENDERSON, DENNIS R. "The Yugoslavian Agricultural Economy: Structure, Policy and International Trade." *Economics and Sociology Studies* No. 576.
Request above paper from author, Department of Agricultural Economics, The Ohio State University, 2120 Fyffe Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210.
- HILLMAN, JIMMY S. "Agricultural Protection: An Observation and Warning." *Western Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 3, No. 2, December 1978.
Request copy of article from author, Department of Agricultural Economics, Room 410, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721.
- HOLLAND, FORREST D., and RONALD L. MEEKHOF. *FEEDSIM Description and Computer Program Documentation*. Purdue Agriculture Experiment Station Bulletin No. 221.
Request bulletin from Ron Meekhof, USDA, ESCS, Room 341, 500 12th Street S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250.
- JACOBSON, R. E., J. W. HAMMOND, and T. F. GRAF. *Pricing Grade A Milk Used in Manufactured Dairy Products*. Research Bulletin 1105, Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, December 1978.
Request a copy of the publication from either of the three authors respectively, at the Departments of Agricultural Economics, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota, or University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.
- KLEMME, RICHARD M., and MARSHALL A. MARTIN. *Forecasting Indiana Corn Yields: An Econometric Approach*. Purdue Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 218, February 1979.
Request copy of bulletin from Marshall Martin, Department of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907.
- MARTIN, MARSHALL A., PAUL R. ROBBINS, J. WILLIAM UHRIG, and BOB F. JONES. *The 1979 Farm Program*. Purdue University EC-484, February 1979.
Request copy of release from Mailing Room, Agricultural Administration Building, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907.
- MCCALLA, A. F. *International Agricultural Research: Potential Impact on World Food Markets and on UK Agricultural Strategy*. CAS Paper 5.
Request copy of above paper (cost 1.50 pound sterling) from The Centre for Agricultural Strategy, University of Reading, Reading RG6 2AU, United Kingdom.
- MEADOWS, DENNIS. Publications available from Research Group focusing on wood as a source of energy.
Request list and costs from author, Resource Policy Center, Thayer School of Engineering, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755.
- MILLER, B. R., and C. O. ANDERSON. *Simulation of Alternative Peanut Policies and Their Impact on the Peanut Production Area Economy in Georgia*. Georgia Agriculture Experiment Station Research Bulletin 233.
Request bulletin from senior author, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Georgia, Room 208 Conner Hall, Athens, Georgia 30602.
- NATIONAL PUBLIC POLICY EDUCATION COMMITTEE. *Speaking of Trade: Its Effect on Agriculture*. Minnesota Agricultural Extension Service Special Report No. 72, November 1978.
Request copy from a public affairs specialist or the Office of the Extension Director in a Land Grant University or USDA Extension Service.

NELSON, PAUL E. *Do Food Stamp and Other Customers Buy the Same Products in Supermarkets?* USDA, ESCS, Agricultural Economics Report No. 421, March 1979.

Request report from ESCS Information, Room 0054 South Building, USDA, Washington, D.C. 20250.

NOVAKOVIC, A. M., E. M. BABB, D. R. MARTELLA, and J. E. PRATT. "A Computer Program Documentation of the Dairy Market Policy Simulator (Model A)." Ag. Econ. Staff Paper No. 79-4, April 1979.

Request Staff Paper from senior author, Department of Agricultural Economics, 312 Warren Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853.

PENN, J. B. "The Carter Farm and Food Policies." Paper for the meeting of Australian Agricultural Economics Society, February 1979.

Request copy of paper from author, USDA, ESCS, Room 440, 500 12th Street S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250.

PENN, J. B. "Future Directions in U.S. Farm Policy," March 1979, and "An Historical Perspective of U.S. Agricultural Policy."

Request copies of these speeches from author, address above.

RASMUSSEN, WAYNE D., and GLADYS L. BAKER. *Price-Support and Adjustment Programs from 1933 Through 1978: A Short History.* ESCS Agriculture Information Bulletin No. 424, February 1979.

Request publication from Gladys L. Baker, Agriculture History Branch, NED, USDA, Washington, D.C. 20250.

SALATHE, LARRY, and WILLIAM T. BOEHM. *Food Prices in Perspective: A Summary Analysis.* USDA, ESCS-53, April 1979.

Request report from ESCS Information, Room 0054 South Building, USDA, Washington, D.C. 20250. Longer version of report, *Food Prices in Perspective*, Agriculture Information Bulletin No. 427, July 1979, is also available from same source.

SEITZ, WESLEY D., C. ROBERT TAYLOR, R. G. F. SPITZE, CRAIG OSTEEN, and MACK C. NELSON. "Economic Impacts of Soil Erosion Control." *Land Economics*, Vol. 55, February 1979.

Request copy of article from R. G. F. Spitze, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801.

STANTON, B. F., and THOMAS F. WEAVER. "Leadership from the Northeast on Food and Agricultural Policy." Cornell Agricultural Economics staff paper No. 79-7, April 1979.

Request paper from senior author, 148 Warren Hall, Department of Agricultural Economics, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853.

TALBOT, ROSS B. *The Chicken War: An International Trade Conflict Between the U.S. and the European Economic Community, 1961-1974.*

Request publication from Iowa State University Press, South State Avenue, Ames, Iowa 50011 (may be a charge).

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE. *Foreign Investment in U.S. Agricultural Land.* U.S. Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, January 1979.

Request copy from Warren Oxford, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510.

VERTREES, JAMES G., and PETER M. EMERSON. *Consequences of Dairy Price Support Policy*.
Congressional Budget Office, March 1979.
Request report from Peter Emerson, 2nd and D Streets S.W., Congressional
Budget Office, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C. 20515.

